

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

In the Detailed Action of the Office Action dated March 22, 2005, the Office has requested a restriction to one of allegedly five inventions, whose claims are grouped into claim sets I (claims 1-8; 30-38), II (claims 9-13), III (claims 14-16; 20-25; 39-41; 45-49), IV (claims 17-19; 26-29; 42-44; 50-52), and V (claims 53-61), and respectively are referred to as alleged Inventions I, II, III, IV, and V.

Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn since no showing is provided that there are distinct inventions. For example, the only statement Applicants are able to find is a conclusion without any supporting factual support and no reasons are provided. For example, the only statement states "Distinctiveness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP §806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP §806.04(h))". Applicants respectfully submit that this statement is only a conclusion and that no reasons are given to support the conclusion. For example, the restriction requirement fails to identify the intermediate product and the final product referred to in the above statement, and fails to provide a showing as required under MPEP §806.04(b) since there is no proof or facts showing that the intermediate product is useful for other than to make the final product. Since the restriction requirement fails to provide any basis for the restriction, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction should be withdrawn.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully request that if the restriction requirement is not withdrawn, that the Examiner reconsider the grouping of claims. Applicants respectfully note for example that the claims in alleged sets I and II both have identical preambles and both sets of

claims require, for example, an event table, a rule execution component, rules, an event engine, and a configuration engine. As such, a common search would need to be performed with respect to multiple claims in these sets. In addition, alleged inventions III and IV also have much common subject matter that appears to have been overlooked and as such these claim groupings also appear to be improper. Applicants believe for at least the reasons given above, that the claim groupings as given are not supported and as such, the restriction should be withdrawn.

If the restriction is reasserted or maintained, Applicants respectfully elect Group I (claims 1-8 and 30-38) to be examined.

The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/22/05

By: Donald L. Andruska  
Donald L. Andruska  
Registration No. 55,798

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
Phone: (312) 609-7500  
Fax: (312) 609-5005